

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 18 have been amended herein. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 18 do not add new matter. Support for the amendments to these claims can be found, for example, on page 10, line 15 through page 11, line 6. The title of the invention has been amended to "Modifying a Shared Resource". The title has been amended to be more descriptive as suggested by the examiner.

The examiner rejected claim 1 under 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6401103 issued to Ho et al., herein referred to as Ho et al. Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "determine if a **first portion of data fields of the original data differs from a corresponding first portion of data fields of current data** included in a current version of the web page, while ignoring differences between a second portion of the data fields of the original data and a corresponding second portion of the data fields of current data included in the current version of the web page." Ho discloses, "If the state data segment 128 and current data segment 108 are equivalent, the comparison module 114 determines that the data segment 108 has not been changed during the web user update." Ho does not teach or suggest comparing only a portion of original data with a portion of the current data as in Applicant's claim 1. Applicant's system has the advantage of excluding data that can be continually changing but does not effect the modification, for example, time, date, stock quotes, and prices. None of the reference cited by the examiner teach or suggest the elements of amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowed.

Claims 7, 13, and 18 have been amended in the same manner as claim 1. Based on the same arguments as applied to claim 1, claims 7, 13, and 18 should be allowed.

With regard to the other claims, since claims 2-6 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, claims 8-12 depend directly or indirectly on claim 7, claims 14-17 depend directly or indirectly on claim 13, and claims 19-21 depend directly or indirectly on claim 18, these claims should be allowed as submitted.

Applicant's discussion of particular positions of the Examiner does not constitute a concession with respect to any positions that are not expressly contested by the Applicant. Applicant's emphasis of particular reasons why the claims are patentable does not imply that

Applicant : Aaron A. McBride et al.
Serial No. : 09/758,491
Filed : January 10, 2001
Page : 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-323001 / P9684

there are not other sufficient reasons why the claims are patentable. Applicant's amendment of the claims does not constitute a concession that the claims are not allowable in their unamended form.